

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DERARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address; COMMISSIONER FOR HATENTS (O. Bod 1450) Alexandra Virginia 22(13-1450) vww.usgla.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/776,734	02/11/2004	Sherman Robert Alpert	· YOR920030606US1 (163-25)	2809	
24336 KEUSEY TU	7590 03/09/2007 FUNJIAN & BITETTO, P.0	EXAMINER			
20 CROSSWAYS PARK NORTH			MAHMOOD, REZWANUL		
SUITE 210 WOODBURY	NY 11797		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
W 00DD 0 K 1	.,		. 2164		
	•		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			03/09/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/776,734	ALPERT ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Rezwanuł Mahmood			

Rezwanu	i Mahmood	2164	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the	cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICAT	TION IN CONDITION FOI	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application and Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 time periods:	s: (1) an amendment, affi neal (with appeal fee) in c CFR 1.114. The reply mu	davit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	ice, which FR 41.31; or (3)
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Act no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SI Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY C TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).	ion, or (2) the date set forth X MONTHS from the mailing CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejecti FIRST REPLY WAS F	on. ILED WITHIN
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened size torth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	the corresponding amount of tatutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropr nally set in the final Offi	ate extension fee ce action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension there a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the AMENDMENTS 	eof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of th	ns of the date of e appeal. Since
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);	n and/or search (see NO	ΓE below);	
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a correspondence 			ine issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			(DTOL 204)
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See at	tached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if non-allowable claim(s). 	submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will no how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided belo The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e	explanation of
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before of because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficien was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	r on the date of filing a No t reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> it or other evidence i	ot be entered s necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was	all rejections under appea not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the standard REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	atus of the claims after e	ntry is below or attact	ned.
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NC See Continuation Sheet.	T place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:
12. \square Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/0	08) Paper No(s)		
13. Other:	C ₂	fau	
	pp	SHAHID ALAM	· 3

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

The examiner states that the applicant's arguments are not persuasive for the following reasons:

- 1) Applicant argues that the steps of performing a search and then features in accordance with the corpus of documents are used to categorize documents are not disclosed or suggested in the Liang reference. The examiner maintains that the feature is cited in the prior art, as disclosed in the Final Office action. In Paragraph 51 lines 9-35 Liang teaches performing a search and presenting the search results in categories that are specific to the search keywords.
- 2) Applicant argues that the steps of selecting one document term in proximity with the matched token, and using the selected term to categorize the terms into at least one category to provide the at least one category which is related to the search query term is not disclosed or suggested by Liang. The examiner maintains that the feature is cited in the prior art, as disclosed in the Final Office action. In Paragraph 89 lines 1-16 and Paragraph 90 lines 1-15 Liang teaches generating keywords and keywords combinations for the keywords provided by the user and submit the keywords and keywords combinations to conduct a search. The returned results are filtered based on concepts and semantic meanings of the search keywords provided and are then categorized, based on conceptual match, exact keywords match, amount of information on topic etc. The terms used from the document to categorize inherently are in proximity to the matched keywords.
- 3) Applicant argues that a feature extractor and a feature categorizer are disclosed nowhere in the Liang reference. The examiner maintains that the features are cited in the prior art, as disclosed in the Final Office action. Liang teaches in Paragraph 94 lines 1-5 a concept/semantic analyzer that analyzes documents with the user's selection objectives and advise, and performs a concept extraction and summarization. Liang teaches In Paragraph 95 lines 9-14 a categorization, filter and ranking engine that categorizes the search result documents with the assistance of the concept/semantic analyzer.